United Nations S/PV.7143

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7143rd meeting

Wednesday, 19 March 2014, 10.15 a.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	France	Mrs. Le Fraper du Hellen
	Jordan	Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein
	Lithuania	Mr. Baublys
	Nigeria	Mr. Sarki
	Republic of Korea	Ms. Paik Ji-ah
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Rwanda	Mr. Gasana
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Shearman
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

14-26914 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746)

The President (*spoke in French*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to participate in this meeting.

Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2012/746, which contains the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict.

I wish to warmly welcome the Deputy Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson, and I give him the floor.

The Deputy Secretary-General: Thank you for organizing this timely debate, Madam President. I know how committed and experienced you and several of your colleagues on the Council are to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Peacebuilding encompasses a variety of political and development actions by United Nations peacekeeping operations, special political missions, country teams and other actors. It lies at the heart of United Nations aspirations in countries emerging from conflict.

Just two weeks ago, the Secretary-General visited Sierra Leone to mark the closure of the United Nations peacebuilding operation, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. The transition to the country team is under way, in close collaboration with the Government of Sierra Leone and with the continued political engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The example of Sierra Leone, and of Timor Leste before it, provides evidence of how post-conflict peacebuilding can prevent a relapse into violence and underpin a country's development after conflict. On the other hand, the recent upsurges of violence in the Central African Republic and in South Sudan demonstrate the unpredictable environment for peacebuilding and the great risks involved. That is why we must always be prepared to adapt and seek new approaches based on experience and evidence.

In 2012, the Secretary-General identified inclusivity, institution-building and the need for sustained international support and mutual accountability as three priority areas for peacebuilding. Let me say a few words about each.

First, with respect to inclusivity, national ownership, national leadership and national political commitment are indispensable elements for durable peace. But peace agreements that involve only a limited number of protagonists or key actors often fail to meet peoples' needs and expectations, and therefore turn out to be fragile. While peace settlements admittedly need to include so-called people with guns, peacebuilding primarily requires political processes with broad participation and public accountability.

In Guinea last year, the Secretary-General's Special Representative for West Africa, Mr. Said Djinnit, facilitated a political dialogue, with support from the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund. It promoted trust among political parties and strengthened the role of women, including as electoral monitors. Those were critical elements for the largely peaceful elections held in September 2013. In Yemen over the past two years, the Secretary-General's Special Adviser worked to bring the voices of women and youth into the country's national dialogue. Both examples highlight the importance of gender-responsive peacebuilding and the inclusion of women in peace processes.

Let me underscore the Secretary-General's engagement in that area, through the commitment to allocate 15 per cent of United Nations-managed peacebuilding funds to projects promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women. I am aware that the goal has not yet been reached, but it remains a priority concern in peacebuilding.

My second point concerns institution-building for fostering peace, development and social cohesion.

Inclusive institution-building in the areas of justice, education and health care can help States gain broad popular confidence and ensure that disputes and political competition are handled without resort to violence. Effective and impartial security and judicial institutions are particularly important for building respect for human rights and the rule of law. We see the centrality of institution-building in Liberia, where United Nations support for the establishment of five regional security and justice hubs has helped to restore faith in the country's security services. The expansion of judicial services and legal reforms are central parts of Liberia's statement of mutual commitments with the Peacebuilding Commission. Ssupport to the Land Commission and so-called "peace huts" has promoted the peaceful resolution of disputes. I know that the representative of Jordan is very familiar with that point.

The examples of successful peacebuilding I have mentioned depend upon sustained and predictable financial and political international support, which brings me to my third point. Where a United Nations mission is making the transition to a United Nations country team, such as in Burundi or Sierra Leone, we need to ensure continued funding for central activities. We also need to provide the necessary political support and act decisively at critical moments. As the Council noted during its recent mission to Mali, cantonment is a key confidence-building measure in the peace process. Early and reliable funding by the Peacebuilding Fund is essential for the ability of the United Nations to support cantonment.

In Somalia, the New Deal Compact has aligned donors with the priorities articulated by the Government and Somali counterparts. That has strengthened mutual accountability. In Liberia, a publicly accessible so-called "dashboard" showing the details of donor funding has promoted transparency.

I would also like to add that the African Union engagement in the Central African Republic, Somalia and elsewhere in Africa underlines the importance of working in close partnership with regional organizations in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. Building a regional environment conducive to peace should be a critical priority for countries emerging from conflict. That will help them to strengthen fragile transitions and reduce illicit arms or financial flows.

The Special Representatives of the Secretary-General in Burundi, the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau have worked actively with the Peacebuilding Commission to ensure the cooperation of neighbouring countries and regional organizations. Last year, in May, the Secretary-General and the World Bank President visited the Great Lakes region of Africa and, together with the Chairperson of the African Union, the President of the African Development Bank and the Commissioner for Development of the European Union, visited the Sahel in November. That demonstrated the welcome joint commitment to supporting transformative work and engagement for peace and development. Similar partnerships have been developed in the Great Lakes region, where the United Nations and the European Union are working with Governments and civil society to improve natural-resource management.

Member States created a new peacebuilding architecture at the Summit in 2005 in response to the frequent relapse into violence of countries emerging from armed conflict. Given its diverse composition, the Peacebuilding Commission is well placed to help ensure the coherence of efforts and sustained attention in support of peace. I would also assert that the Peacebuilding Fund is now widely recognized for its usefulness and flexibility. But questions remain as to where and how the Commission can be most helpful and relevant. The Commission and its country configurations are working hard to play a useful advisory role to the Security Council and to bring to bear the collective weight of Member States in support of peacebuilding priorities.

We should recall, however, that the Peacebuilding Commission is a subsidiary organ of this body and, I stress, can be of optimal use only if the Council empowers it and utilizes its potential. When the Peacebuilding Commission was established — I happened to be President of the General Assembly at the time — we believed that the Council could benefit from an advisory body that could take a longer, post-conflict perspective. I would like to appeal to the Council to take advantage of the review of the peacebuilding architecture in 2015 to shape the kind of Peacebuilding Commission that will be relevant, catalytic and effective, not least from the perspective of the Security Council and, naturally, in the interests of those States that are affected. The realities in the world certainly remind us that there is a need for such a function and such a role for the United Nations. I look forward to hearing the new Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission speak on that challenge.

The challenges are many, serious and urgent in countries like Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Mali and Somalia. I am confident that the Governments and the people of those countries could gain considerably from an efficient and broadly anchored United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the Mr. Eliasson for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Patriota.

Mr. Patriota: I also thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his statement.

The Peacebuilding Commission is pleased to contribute to the Security Council's interim consideration of the progress made on United Nations peacebuilding efforts in the aftermath of conflict. The periodic reporting by the Secretary-General to the Security Council and the General Assembly on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict offers an opportunity to keep Member States and United Nations operational entities focused on the imperative of joint and coherent efforts to prevent conflict and situations of relapse into conflict.

Peacebuilding is an expression of the international community's recognition that our collective response to conflict must be multifaceted and sustained over the long term. In that context, the Commission recognizes the importance of the main themes set out in the Secretary-General's 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity, institution-building and sustained international support and mutual accountability.

The recent crises in the Central African Republic and South Sudan remind us that the nature of peacebuilding requires a careful examination of strategies for stabilization efforts and their sequencing. Collective and persistent engagement to address this systemic and ongoing deficiency must continue.

In my inaugural statement to the Peacebuilding Commission, on 29 January, I noted that, while sustaining peace is a central objective of the United Nations' peace and security architecture, we face the systemic challenge of the short span of attention and commitment from the international community to the complex and long-term challenges to sustainable peace. The Peacebuilding Commission was indeed mandated to "extend the period of attention given by the international community to post-conflict recovery" (*resolution 1645 (2005), para. 2 (c)*).

A key feature of the Commission's engagement with Burundi and Sierra Leone since 2006 has been to sustain attention to the ongoing political and socioeconomic challenges facing both countries, in which the United Nations heavily invested to re-establish security, strengthen governance structures, promote greater respect for the rule of law, support community recovery and support the early stages of the respective political processes. In support of the United Nations leadership in both countries, the Commission has advised the Security Council over the years on issues requiring immediate attention while also working to mobilize broader support from subregions and international partners in favour of the long-term political and socioeconomic dimensions of peacebuilding.

Both countries are approaching the milestone of transitioning from the Security Council's politically and security-oriented mandated missions to the development-oriented presence of the United Nations country team. An adequate transition from emergency to development remains essential but is still, to a great extent, an ideal fraught with challenges. The change in the nature of the United Nations presence and mandate on the ground in both countries calls for calibrated yet sustained attention to ongoing political and socioeconomic challenges associated with nascent national institutions and governance practices, and strong engagement on the development track.

While we continue to insist that peacebuilding must be nationally owned and that ownership comes with responsibility, the international community must also rise to the occasion and continue to help Burundi and Sierra Leone to stay the course. That is also a consistent message that the Commission and the respective United Nations leadership deliver in, and on behalf of, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia.

The importance of inclusive political processes and national institutions and capacities cannot be overemphasized. In Guinea and in Guinea-Bissau, the Commission's collaboration with the respective United Nations leadership focuses on ensuring that, regardless of the outcome of national elections, political dialogue should remain inclusive and the political space should remain available for the opposition to participate in shaping the future of both countries. No majority Government can alone face the myriad challenges facing a society emerging from conflict.

As demonstrated by the painful turn of events in the Central African Republic, elected Governments that fail to keep the various societal and political forces engaged can drive their countries towards untold tragedies. That is the advice that the United Nations overall and the Commission jointly continue to extend to the political leadership in Burundi, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

A crucial aspect of inclusivity relates to the participation and contribution of women and youth to the peacebuilding process. While women and youth endure the tragic consequences of violent conflicts, they are also strategic agents for societal transformation and emancipation in post-conflict societies. In a declaration adopted by the Peacebuilding Commission last September on women's economic empowerment for peacebuilding, our ministers recognized that

> "the economic empowerment of women greatly contributes to the effectiveness of post-conflict economic activities and economic growth" (*PBC/7/OC/3, para. 4*).

In Guinea-Bissau, I was impressed by the potential contribution of women's organizations to strengthening the economic role of women, thus helping to forge a more inclusive political culture in the country and bringing together different identities, religions and political affiliations. The transformative potential of greater participation by women in the economic and political spheres can provide an invaluable contribution to building more peaceful, democratic and prosperous societies. The gender dimension of peacebuilding deserves our continuing attention and unwavering commitment.

Building or rebuilding institutions in a country emerging from conflict is the practical expression of national ownership and the sustainability of peace. At the same time, institutions take a long time to develop into an efficient medium for political participation and for the delivery of security, justice, basic social services and economic opportunities. The Commission's observation of the contribution of nascent institutions to peacebuilding, such as the National Revenue Authority and the Anti-corruption Commission in Burundi, the National Youth Commission in Sierra Leone and the regional justice and security hubs in Liberia, confirms that institution-building must go beyond establishing and nurturing organizational structures. The capacity of the Government to sustain and empower those institutions to help in rebuilding the social fabric and generating economic opportunities remains a key challenge for the countries concerned. Unless there is a solid commitment from the political leadership, institutions may fall prey to political manipulation or other forms of dysfunction. Through its collaboration with the Peacebuilding Fund and by lending its political weight in support of the United Nations leadership and the Governments concerned, the Commission has supported institution-building related initiatives in Burundi, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

The Commission can certainly do more to support the development of strategies and initiatives that prioritize institution-building and capacity development. In areas such as natural-resource management, transparent financial management for development, domestic revenue-generation and the fight against illicit financial flows and organized crime, the Commission can serve as a platform to mobilize targeted technical support, especially in the context of South-South cooperation.

As the Secretary-General prepares to release his next report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict, later this year, the Commission emphasizes the need for deepening analysis, supported by country examples, of how the United Nations collective and diversified efforts across the security and socioeconomic spectrum of post-conflict response contribute to long-term peacebuilding objectives. There is a need to know in what ways the United Nations mandated presence and evolving operational practice has made a real difference in the countries affected by or emerging from conflict. The Commission will benefit from that analysis as it seeks to further deepen, focus and calibrate its advisory function to the Council and its support to the United Nations leadership in the field. That is a critical aspect of the Commission's early preparation for the upcoming mandated review in 2015. In the same vein, in light of the Council's presidential note contained in document S/2003/515, of 28 August 2013, regular informal interactive meetings with the members of the Security Council will further sharpen the focus on peacebuilding-related topics, particularly in the country-specific contexts.

In June 2014, the Commission will convene its first-ever annual session. The session will offer an opportunity for Member States, the United Nations system and other actors to address and focus on a peacebuilding-related theme with a view to elaborating how intergovernmental policy and political support can improve and make a difference for people in countries emerging from conflict. We trust that this annual

effort can reinforce and help orient the evolving United Nations peacebuilding agenda, not least by engaging key partners from regional organizations, international financial institutions and civil society. A viable partnership with those actors is no longer a matter of choice. It is indeed a necessity, and that is where the Peacebuilding Commission has its special niche.

Finally, allow me a final word on the interrelated topics of inclusivity, institution-building and mutual accountability. While keeping a focus on the centrality of inclusive national development for peacebuilding, let us not cede to the mental habits of viewing development ultimately as a technology of security. Our efforts must remain people-centered. True peace is also built upon an enlarged sense of development, as emancipation and fulfilment of multidimensional human aspirations, including through cultural and social interconnections. I believe we can put that idea at the very centre of our peacebuilding efforts, while fostering greater solidarity and true empathy so as to dispel the logic of providers and beneficiaries through improved reciprocity and mutual recognition.

For all of us, there is much to learn from the struggles of the people facing peacebuilding challenges in their daily lives. The Peacebuilding Commission can also be an important platform for connecting their voice, promoting a network for new encounters and allowing for an active and horizontal flow of knowledge and experience. In 2014, we will have plenty of opportunities to embark on that enriched dialogue.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Patriota for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Clark.

Ms. Clark: I thank the Council for the invitation to brief it on this topic.

Since the peacebuilding architecture was established, in 2005, the United Nations has made important progress in improving its approaches to peacebuilding, building on lessons learned and practical experience on the ground. Today, peacebuilding is mainstreamed across the United Nations system and is used in different contexts and situations affected by conflict and violence.

Peacebuilding has also been a driver of reform and initiatives such as the relatively new United Nations global focal point for police, justice and corrections. Individual United Nations agencies have developed their own peacebuilding strategies on the basis of their mandates and programmes.

However, there continue to be some important challenges in United Nations support for peacebuilding. For members of the United Nations Development Group, a more inclusive approach to peacebuilding than we often see today is a key priority. Achieving sustainable peace requires the engagement and participation of all social groups, beyond the main protagonists to a conflict, and urban centres. It requires meaningful participation by women, youth and other marginalized groups.

It also requires that we maintain a sustained presence at the local level in order to understand and respond to the immediate and longer-term needs of communities, including on the issues of livelihoods, basic social services, the provision of security and justice for victims. In that respect, the United Nations worked with local authorities in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2013 to investigate five recent incidents of serious crimes affecting 900 victims of sexual and gender-based violence, murder and pillage and to bring those responsible to justice.

Institution-building is closely linked with peacebuilding. However, we need to take a less narrow view of that nexus and to strengthen our understanding of how a valid social contract can contribute to peace and how international actors can support such a contract developing. Without both responsive and inclusive State institutions and a vibrant civil society, there is unlikely to be either sustained peace or a basis for long-term development.

An example of an approach that addresses both those elements is to be found in Somalia, where the United Nations is working with the Federal Government to assess and strengthen its capacities to perform core State functions. At the same time, we are also focusing on supporting governance at the local level — the level at which people most frequently engage with the authorities and to which they are most likely to turn for services and support.

Our efforts in Somalia have enabled local Governments and municipalities to collect property and business taxes. That revenue is now funding municipal services for people in approximately 16 districts across the country. Local elections are being held, waste is being collected and roads are being maintained. If trust

in Government institutions is to be built following a conflict, the local level is a good place to start.

Peacebuilding requires predictable and sustained international support on the basis of clear and focused priorities and mutual accountability. In recent years, Governments and international actors have agreed on compacts or mutual accountability frameworks to provide that basis and for the ongoing monitoring of progress and dialogue. The United Nations has supported such mutual accountability processes in Afghanistan, Yemen, Sierra Leone and Somalia. We hope that more countries will engage in that way.

By setting clear and realistic goals that cover the whole peacebuilding spectrum, including building inclusive politics, security, justice, livelihoods and the delivery of social services, and by agreeing on how to deliver on those goals, we can help to strengthen the credibility of peace processes and peacebuilding and to ensure effective delivery and results.

For that approach to work, both national and international actors must be fully committed to delivering on shared goals and be willing to work together. That will help to reduce the risk of failure and to strengthen the chance of peace processes succeeding.

Nonetheless, success can never be guaranteed, nor will every individual programme in a post-conflict context produce results. Such situations are inherently risky and setbacks are frequent.

It is therefore important to better integrate risk management in peacebuilding approaches and to ensure that we are better at balancing the risks of failure of individual programmes with the importance of trying to make a difference where we can. Discussions on managing the risks of operating in such difficult environments needs to be ongoing with national Governments and with donors.

Pooled funding is one important way of sharing and managing risks together. The United Nations recently established multi-partner trust funds in Mali and Somalia to enable donors to channel funding towards the programmes that may be more difficult for individual donors to support directly. Those pooled funds enable stronger risk mitigation and management through a shared platform and divide the residual risk among several participants. The Mali Stabilization Fund has already had an significnat and positive impact on the situation in the country.

When setbacks occur in countries, as they have in such a traumatic way in the Central African Republic and South Sudan in recent months, it is important that we at the United Nations maintain our capability to support and work with local partners and to protect countries' capacities to deal with and respond to the crisis themselves.

So often, funding for vital early recovery work with communities is squeezed out during crises and local communities lose the ability to support themselves. Then, when peacebuilding opportunities arise, we are forced to start all over again from a worse position. We must find ways to address that conundrum and to ensure predictable funding for early recovery.

Let me conclude by emphasizing the paramount importance of national ownership and leadership in peacebuilding processes. At the end of the day, sustained peace and long-term development, led and fully owned by countries themselves, is always the goal of peacebuilding. We must support countries to make progress towards that goal as rapidly as possible.

That is why it is important to strengthen inclusion, institution-building and mutual accountability as crucial elements in peacebuilding and as foundations for national ownership. While crisis and conflict create many obstacles to such objectives in the short term, we should never lose sight of that long-term goal. I hope that that goal will remain a major priority in the discussion of how to strengthen United Nations peacebuilding and prepare for the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in 2015.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ms. Clark for her briefing.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful for the briefings by Mr. Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme. They have given us an assessment of the work, progress and challenges facing the Peacebuilding Commission.

In our statement, we will focus on the three priority areas set out by the Secretary-General in his report (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity, institution-building and sustained international support and mutual

accountability. In our view, those aspects are central to peacebuilding and to establishing the necessary conditions for progress and to prevent a relapse into new situations of instability and tension.

From an early stage, inclusivity, seeks to ensure the participation of all actors and parties involved in the conflict and of those who, suffering the consequences, are often not considered participants in the national reconstruction and peacebuilding processes.

Inclusivity can provide legitimacy to reconstruction processes and can involve and engage the population in such processes, thereby promoting social cohesion and national ownership and laying the foundations for lasting agreements. In that way, they also prevent frustration, tension and possible relapse into conflict at the same time as they allow for work on the underlying roots of a conflict with a view to reconciliation among the affected population.

In that context, we draw attention to the fundamental role that women should have in post-conflict and peacebuilding processes. We express our concern that women remain marginalized from political power and planning in peacebuilding processes and in many national processes in general, in spite of the Council's call in resolution 1325 (2000) that women should be ensured greater representation at all levels of decision-making. We must continue working towards the effective implementation of that resolution and the seven-point action plan on gender-responsive peacebuilding set out in the Secretary-General's 2010 report on women's participation in peacebuilding (S/2010/466).

With regard to building national institutions in the post-conflict phase of peacebuilding, the process of institutionalization must be adaptable and able to respond to the needs of the population, while possessing transparent working mechanisms that make their work subject to accountability. In that work, particular attention should be paid to the political and social dynamics of the country and its practices, ensuring the central importance of national ownership of such processes. Institutions that are perceived as legitimate and independent will allow for progress towards a successful transition. Such progress will strengthen respect for the rule of law and its underlying principles, which is essential for the stability and development of the country.

With regard to sustained international support and mutual accountability, we must recognize the importance of political and financial support and commitments for making progress in national strategies aimed at peacebuilding. Such efforts require certainty and predictability when it comes to resources. We therefore acknowledge the importance of partnerships, as noted in the report of the Secretary-General, with the World Bank, other institutions and the private sector. Donations must respect and contribute to national peacebuilding plans. It is the country emerging from conflict itself, with the support of the Commission and of the international community, that should designate the plans it deems most relevant. We underscore the role that regional and subregional organizations can play in providing the necessary political support to the peacebuilding process and, as far as possible, financial support.

Against a complex international backdrop, we issue a call for the work to continue on mechanisms that could provide greater certainty in the flow of resources. In that regard, I am pleased to report that my country expects to continue its annual contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund.

In our capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2009 and during our membership in 2012, we had the opportunity to learn first-hand about, and become involved in, the Commission's work to promote peace and rebuild the countries that are part of the various configurations. We acknowledge the progress achieved. However, much remains to be done to ensure the full implementation of the objectives for which the Commission was established. In that regard, we believe that the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations could expand its scope to consider peacebuilding and establish linkages with the relevant actors in this field.

We conclude by reiterating the call to continue perfecting the relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission and improving and expanding the channels of communication between the two bodies, in particular when it comes to considering the renewal of mandates.

Ms. Paik Ji-ah (Republic of Korea): I thank you, Madam President, for having organized today's meeting. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson for his comprehensive briefing. I also thank Ambassador

Antonio de Aguiar Patriota and Administrator Helen Clark, who provided value-added insights from the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations Development Programme, respectively.

The issue of post-conflict peacebuilding is multifaceted and covers a wide range of interconnected values that the United Nations has pursued. If it were not for the effective condition of the entire United Nations system and beyond, the task of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict would remain difficult. We hope that today's discussion can be another step forward towards the solidification of our shared strategy for peacebuilding in which the role of women is sufficiently taken into consideration.

As today's briefers stressed, the success of peacebuilding depends on the implementation of key priorities, such as inclusivity, institution-building, sustainable support and mutual accountability, with a horizontal focus on gender mainstreaming. Today I would like to address the challenges we face and ways to overcome those impediments to achieve progress in peacebuilding.

First, we have seen that it is often difficult to incorporate inclusivity into local political culture. Winner-take-all politics and the alienation of minorities undermine hard-won yet still fragile stability and even lead to relapses into conflict. Empirical evidence shows that if a Government fails to address social grievances, the international community loses confidence and becomes reluctant to translate their development partnership into action, which is crucial to take on the root causes of conflicts. Social cohesion through reconciliation should be the basis for early stabilization as well as for long-term prosperity. In that context, we would like to underline that women can play an important role in ensuring social cohesion and political legitimacy.

Secondly, delays in institution-building threaten the credibility of newly established authorities in post-conflict situations, as illustrated by the case of the Central African Republic. Providing basic services is critical to achieve stability and to discourage people from taking the law into their own hands.

We believe that scarce resources can be better utilized through effective coordination among the relevant organizations operating in the same areas. Similar tasks performed by each organization need to be streamlined and rearranged according to their respective comparative advantages under the "delivering as one" perspective. The role of the United Nations Development Programme can be strengthened in terms of the division of labour in relation to political and peacekeeping missions. The coordination efforts between the United Nations and the World Bank for the security and development of the Great Lakes region and the Sahel are commendable examples.

Thirdly, interactive cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Security Council has yet to reach its full potential. In order to create synergy, both bodies should be interdependent, not just out of principle but based on mutual needs. Both sides need to make more efforts. The PBC and its country-specific configurations should be able to provide value-added consultations to the Security Council, while the latter could be more engaged and provide enhanced feedback.

For a response tailored to meet each country's unique historical and social challenges, the Council needs to take better advantage of country-specific configurations. In particular, we hope that the PBC configuration for the Central African Republic, under the new leadership of Morocco, will strengthen cooperation with the United Nations field-based mission, beginning with the preparation process, taking into consideration the possible dispatch of Blue Helmets.

Fourthly, the Secretary-General's seven-point action plan on gender-responsive peacebuilding should be strenuously maintained. Women are too often victimized in conflict areas, and their role is still regarded as secondary, not only in peacebuilding but in the general process of development. The role of women could be maximized if and when Governments and the international community continue to systematically empower women. We long for the day when women will no longer need quotas to fulfil their full potential, as witnessed in many countries across the globe.

Lastly, we would like to briefly mention the Republic of Korea's participation in efforts aimed at the peacebuilding process. In addition to the financial contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund and the United Nations Civilian Capacities Initiative, the Republic of Korea will continue to explore ways to provide value-added contributions under our shared vision.

Mr. Sarki (Nigeria): Let me begin by commending you, Madam President, for convening this meeting on one of the very important structures of the

United Nations dealing with peace and post-conflict reconstruction and development in affected societies. Let me also thank His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, for his briefing this morning, and Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, for her briefing. I particularly wish to thank His Excellency Ambassador Patriota, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for his briefing on the perspective of the PBC.

I recall that in 2005 to 2006 I was in Geneva when the Secretary-General's document "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all" (A/59/2005) was being discussed and the configuration or establishment of the PBC was actualized. The PBC and the Human Rights Council gave a clear signal to the whole world that the United Nations was desirous of continuing to deepen the implementation of peace and human-rights elements all over the world. The third element, which remains outstanding, was the reform of the Security Council, which we are now looking forward to taking place soon.

Nigeria commends the Peacebuilding Commission for all its contributions to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts in the aftermath of conflicts. The example of Sierra Leone is very good testimony to the work of the Commission, which has been drawn down today because of the success of the implementations of various elements.

Nigeria also notes that today's briefing is taking place in accordance with the presidential statement of 20 December 2012 (S/PRST/2012/29), which invited the Secretary-General to brief the Council on the progress made in the implementation of the his 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746).

That periodic report to the Security Council and the General Assembly on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict highlights the need to strengthen collective and coherent efforts to prevent conflicts and to avoid relapsing into conflict. We also support and encourage regular interactive meetings among Member States, through which we can exchange views on issues on the agenda of the PBC at all levels. That is consistent with the note by the Council President of 28 August 2013 (S/2013/515), which calls for a regular informal interactive meeting with the members.

The establishment of the PBC was a statement of our aspirations for sustainable peace. Its institutional structure was designed to permit stakeholders, both within and outside the United Nations system, to contribute to the realization of those aspirations in post-conflict countries. Indeed, the PBC has been the rallying point for key stakeholders in the work of peacebuilding in marshalling available resources, in galvanizing political support to countries on its agenda and in coordinating the relevant actors within and outside the United Nations system in the promotion of peacebuilding objectives. In particular, we must appreciate the contributions of the country-specific configurations, which have been rightly described as the heart and soul of the PBC, and therefore its greatest potential.

The PBC has continued to focus the attention of the international community on the political and socioeconomic challenges in countries under its mandate. The Commission's engagement in Burundi and Sierra Leone since 2006, for example, has helped highlight the challenges facing those countries. United Nations missions in both countries are now in transition from the Security Council's security- and politically oriented mandates to the development-oriented mandate of the United Nations country teams.

While bearing in mind that the primary responsibility of peacebuilding efforts rests squarely on the relevant Governments, strengthening their capacity constitutes the foundation for their success in that regard. Therefore, we call on all Member States to forge more effective partnerships with the countries concerned by assisting their Governments in building national capacity. We should initiate and support all efforts aimed at putting national Governments in charge as we continue to emphasize the need for adherence to crucial elements such as credibility, accountability, effectiveness and responsibility.

In that regard, we call on Member States to continue to assist Burundi and Sierra Leone and to ensure that both countries remain on course. The same request is made in respect of Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia.

Nigeria continues to demonstrate its commitment to the peaceful settlement of conflicts, sustainable peace and development. We have stood at the forefront of global peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts, especially by standing by the United Nations in all its peace ventures, including by being a member of the PBC since its inception. From the lessons we have learned over the years, we believe that sincere support

for national ownership should be a core principle in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts.

For that reason, Nigeria looks forward to the first-ever annual session of the PBC, to be held in June 2014. It is expected that the session will afford us an opportunity to discuss how to engage key partners to support national ownership of peacebuilding efforts. In addition, we would like to stress the following issues as food for thought ahead of the 2014 session.

First, in view of the fact that much still needs to be done in order to make optimal use of the PBC instrument, we expect that the session will consider ways and means by which the PBC mandates can be strengthened to attain that objective. We must continue to work to ensure that the Commission remains central and key to the development of post-conflict States and that it continues to occupy its rightful place in the United Nations system.

Secondly, we must improve on the coordination, the coherence and the clear delineation of responsibilities among key stakeholders in the United Nations peacebuilding architecture so as to prevent the duplication of effort and maximize output.

Thirdly, and lastly, we should explore ways of mobilizing support for long-term political and socioeconomic dimensions of peacebuilding from the subregions and from international partners.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): Let me thank you, Madam President, for organizing this important meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I am convinced that discussions of this nature can significantly contribute to the improvement and streamlining of practices in peacebuilding and post-conflict construction and initiatives. I would also like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson; the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Ms. Helen Clark; and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriota of Brazil, for their valuable contributions.

As the Council knows, my country went from a post-conflict situation to a contributor to peacekeeping operations. Our experience alone is an indication that indeed post-conflict peacebuilding is an important process in dealing with both the aftermath of conflicts and conflict-prevention. We recognize the importance of peacebuilding in creating conditions conducive to achieving sustainable and irreversible peace.

However, the international community faces the critical gap between applying existing top-down strategies and the realities on the ground. Too often, post-conflict peacebuilding is regarded as a purely operational process, using blueprints that stipulate what institutions must be established and what systems must be introduced, with technical aspects tending to take priority. Many cases of countries on the PBC agenda lead us to question whether local political mechanisms, capacities and conflict dynamics have been taken into account and whether mechanisms have been put in place to safeguard their continued existence and avoid a relapse of conflicts.

The situation in the Central African Republic speaks for itself. Despite being on the PBC agenda for nearly six years, political instability and administrative weaknesses persisted and, in 2013, the situation in the Central African Republic worsened. Community-based militias were established and the stage was set for simmering violence between Christians and Muslims. In South Sudan, although not on the PBC agenda, renewed fighting occurred in December 2013 despite the United Nations in South Sudan having a strong peacebuilding mandate.

Those two cases demonstrate that the international community in general and the United Nations in particular need to learn how to do things differently. They must adopt targeted post-conflict measures that address the root causes of a particular conflict while at the same time respecting the specificity of each situation, including the local political dynamics, cultural, religious and ethnic configurations and other elements that might play a critical role in post-conflict settings.

We believe that the focus should be on the means and potential available to the international community to support locally driven and locally defined priorities with a clear implementation plan and benchmarks to build local capacities. We are aware that building national capacities in a post-conflict situation already requires an existing capacity from a third party. In that regard, we welcome the establishment of pools of civilian capacity through the CivCaps initiative, which aims at strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to deliver effective, timely and coordinated support to strengthen national institutions in the aftermath of conflict.

Like some of my colleagues, Rwanda also commends the Secretary-General's seven-point action plan on

gender-responsive peacebuilding, which encourages Governments to directly involve women in setting peacebuilding priorities, identifying beneficiaries and monitoring implementation. In addition to the potential for women to contribute to successful peacebuilding, their participation should also be encouraged on the basis of fairness and justice. It is common knowledge that, in countries afflicted by conflicts, women account for half the population, and therefore should be part of the decision-making that would have an impact on their future. Furthermore, women are greatly victimized during conflicts, and therefore deserve to be heard.

There are many avenues through which the inclusion of women in post-conflict peacebuilding can bolster peacebuilding initiatives and thereby contribute to a positive peace outcome. For example, individual women and women's organizations adopt a variety of strategies for reducing fear and uncertainty following conflict and for fostering an environment of trust and collaboration. Furthermore, women who adopt positions of political leadership could provide a direct alternative to traditional political actors, adding to the post-conflict impetus of change and addressing the injustice of the past.

As we commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, it should be recalled that shortly after the genocide it was estimated that the majority of the Rwandan population was female. In their victimization and endurance, women of Rwanda immediately got up and started rebuilding their home country. They assumed non-traditional social and economic roles as heads of household, community leaders and financial providers, meeting the needs of devastated families and communities. Moreover, there was a concerted effort in the Government and among women's groups to address the needs of Rwandan women and engage them in the all-important processes of national reconstruction and reconciliation.

Today, the Rwandan story represents in many ways a process of collective social learning. The Government of Rwanda does not regard the aims of including women as a philosophical idea, but as a necessary practical mechanism for reconciliation, reconstruction, sustainable peace and development.

The post-conflict recovery path adopted by the Government of Rwanda since 1994 can be shared through the initiatives highlighted heretofore. In the spirit of South-South cooperation, for example, and in line with the recommendations from the 2013 report of the Secretary-General on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (S/2014/5), we stand ready to work with United Nations entities that have expressed interest in having Rwanda participate in both initiatives. Rwanda has already provided high-level expertise on a number of issues, including experience and expertise in, inter alia, aid coordination, specialized police capacities, military institution-building and security sector reform.

On the role of the international community, we are grateful that within the United Nations system the Peacebuilding Commission has been given the role of proposing and advising on strategies for post-conflict recovery and of bringing together all the relevant actors involved in resource mobilization and the political, financial and technical aspects of post-conflict recovery. That continues to be an important, yet very complex and challenging, role.

But in the nearly 10 years of the PBC's existence, the United Nations and the Security Council should have been able to identify some best practices and lessons learned to make it more effective and relevant in peacebuilding activities. We also believe that the Security Council can and should contribute to the Commission's efforts to play such a role. Furthermore, Rwanda believes that the Commission can make an impact only if it is able to leverage its unique membership structure and bring political support to its engagement in the field, as well as within intergovernmental forums and through strong advocacy. The collective support from the PBC membership should focus on building national capacities.

To conclude, let me emphasize that there is a need for enhanced coordination and coherency within the United Nations and with the other relevant actors involved. We believe that the PBC should support the United Nations in delivering as one, remain focused on nationally identified priorities in the field and ensure that the United Nations entities at Headquarters and their guidance in the field missions is aligned with national peacebuilding priorities.

Mr. DeLaurentis (United States of America): I thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) Chair Patriota and Adminstrator Clark for their statements this morning.

Maintaining international peace and security is a struggle we contend with across the globe. Increasingly,

we see that building peace is a challenge that we must take on with even greater urgency. Building peace requires a commitment by the international community to stay involved and a commitment by post-conflict countries to uphold the spirit of inclusivity.

A 2010 World Bank report entitled *Conflict Relapse and the Sustainability of Post-Conflict Peace* found that 90 per cent of the conflicts that occurred in the past decade took place in countries that had previously experienced civil war. The problem of civil war, the report found, is not a problem of preventing new conflicts from arising but of permanently ending those that have already started. That reality is sadly brought to life today in the Central African Republic and in South Sudan. Their relapses into conflict remind us of the need for sustained international engagement in post-conflict countries and demand of us that we examine how effective our engagement has been and how we can improve upon it in the future.

The Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific peacebuilding configurations have helped to focus international support for post-conflict countries, build institutions, promote an open political climate and advance stability through development. With the review of the PBC coming up in 2015, now is the time to look at the impact of long-term peacebuilding and how the Council can contribute to that discussion.

We recently saw a successful example of peacebuilding in Sierra Leone, where the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone was recently closed by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in an acknowledgement of how far the country has come since its civil war. The peacebuilding mission there contributed to building strong political institutions and helped solidify gains that the Government and people of Sierra Leone had achieved. Earlier this month, Alhaji Babah Sawaneh, a former child soldier from Sierra Leone, spoke to the Council (see S/PV.7129) and offered proof of the country's healing process. Armed now with a bachelor's degree, Alhaji is an example of the good things that can happen when stability takes root.

Even as Sierra Leone enjoys stability and the United Nations peacebuilding mission draws down, we are reminded that long-term development efforts and continued economic growth are at the foundation of any sustainable peace. We appreciate the strengthened United Nations-World Bank partnership and urge greater dialogue between the World Bank and the Security Council to facilitate post-conflict development strategies. We have seen too often the recurrent issues that make countries vulnerable to relapse: erosion of inclusive political settlements, lack of Government capacity, especially in public finance and the rule of law, and insufficient economic growth and job creation. South Sudan is an example of what happens when political inclusivity is lost, as well as a reminder that we cannot let other countries slip down that path.

In Burundi, inclusivity was a key component of the Arusha Agreement that ended the conflict there in 2001. Today, we are increasingly concerned by signs that the country is moving away from that inclusive spirit. Efforts by the Government to shut down — sometimes violently — meetings of the political opposition are deeply troubling. The international community must maintain its focus on Burundi and continue to work with the Government to foster open political space and credible elections in 2015.

The post-election transition plan for Guinea-Bissau developed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ramos-Horta, and the strategic objectives outlined by the Chair of the PBC Guinea-Bissau configuration, Mr. Patriota, are examples of how a peacebuilding office and the PBC can develop strategic frameworks and coordinate international support for institution-building. Their plans, which call for fast-tracking needed reforms, will help the Government of Guinea-Bissau to hit the ground running. By helping Governments become more responsive and better able to deliver services to their people, peacebuilding efforts can contribute to restoring Government credibility.

Maintaining international peace and security requires strong Government, but also engaged and dedicated communities. All sectors of society must be included in the peace process and throughout the post-conflict period. It is particularly critical to ensure the inclusion of women in political dialogue and mediation efforts. Truth and reconciliation commissions are an essential tool that post-conflict societies can use to help build an inclusive and sustainable peace. We urge the Government of Sri Lanka to move forward on creating such a commission to help their country heal, and we welcome their recent consultations with South Africa in that regard.

The 2015 review of the PBC and peacebuilding architecture will provide an opportunity to focus on ways to sharpen the PBC's potential. The United States attaches great importance to that review and intends to

engage actively, including as a member of the Security Council, and to work closely with PBC members and countries on and off the PBC agenda to enhance the PBC's impact.

Finally, we will be successful in achieving those goals only if we have the people on the ground with the right skills and background to tackle those complicated problems. The United State welcomes the progress made in the Secretary-General's civilian capacity review. We encourage the United Nations system to apply the lessons learned from that review in planning for future post-conflict engagements.

Ms. King (Australia): Thank you, Madam President, for your initiative in convening this briefing, which provides a timely opportunity for us to take stock of the United Nations peacebuilding efforts over the past 12 months. I thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission Antonio Patriota and United Nations Development Programme Administrator Helen Clark for their briefings.

We completely agree with the Deputy Secretary-General that ensuring that we have an efficient and effective peacebuilding architecture is our collective responsibilty. We should be working on that constantly to ensure that the architecture serves the interests of those who genuinely need peacebuilding in their countries.

We will have some important opportunities to address this more systemically in the coming months, but it is also fundamental that we constantly bear in mind in the Council that the relationship between it and the Peacebuilding Commission must be as effective and cooperative as it can possibly be. We strongly support the notion of regular informal exchanges between the Council and the Commission, in line with the Council's own formal commitment to that.

Today I would like to touch upon two priority areas that the Secretary-General outlined in his 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity and institution-building. In doing so, I want to highlight the importance of the participation of women and the role of police in peacebuilding.

The Secretary-General's report has helped underscore that there cannot be any sustainable peace without inclusive peacebuilding processes. Ensuring that all the relevant actors are included in peacebuilding activities is undoubtedly a difficult and time-consuming task, but it needs to be done in order to generate a clear sense of national ownership of the path being forged.

Ensuring that peace agreements and political settlements include all the relevant stakeholders is only the first step. To reduce the risk of relapse into violence, it is imperative that the views and needs of not only parties to the conflict — those who are holding the guns — but also women, youth, ethnic groups and minorities are heard and integrated into the peace process. We need look no further than current efforts to move past conflict to peace in Syria, South Sudan, the Central African Republic and elsewhere to see that without inclusivity, such efforts will not succeed.

Yet that is only the beginning. Inclusivity must be a factor in long-term peacebuilding processes, from consolidating democracy to promoting national reconciliation and strengthening institutions.

The Deputy Secretary-General has highlighted the example of Sierra Leone. We are following a long and brutal civil war. We have witnesses a successful transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peacebuilding. With the completion of the mandate of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone at the end of March, the focus has now moved to ensuring sustained economic development. Inclusivity in the peacebuilding process in Sierra Leone has certainly been a key factor in the success of that process.

The importance of women's participation in peacebuilding cannot be underestimated. Australia welcomes the significant advances made by the Security Council in 2013, including through the adoption of resolution 2122 (2013), on women's participation in conflict resolution and peacebuilding. We must now ensure that we use that road map effectively to realize the benefits of our collective peacebuilding efforts.

Involving women's organizations is a critical part of that agenda. Such groups are often the bridge between formal mechanisms and the needs of local communities. Their views and experiences should be valued accordingly. That means their involvement in the institutions and structures that we are putting in place as part of our peacebuilding efforts. We need to ensure that women are lawmakers, members of the judiciary and advocates for the removal of laws that restrict women's access to justice and economic security.

Institution-building is a central pillar of sustainable peace. Studies show that countries with

strong, accountable and inclusive institutions are 30 to 45 per cent less likely to fall into large-scale conflict. Strengthening institutions and governance at an early stage so as to provide security and the rule of law is a precondition for communities to start to rebuild. We have come to understand that requirement from operations in our region, such as in Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands, but there are clear lessons on such an approach everywhere.

The early development of a credible national police service is often an essential element of effective peacebuilding. Reverting to the issue of inclusivity, the recruitment and training of women to serve as police officers are essential elements of a credible national police service. Female police officers are better able to access women within local communities, provide the support that those communities need and better understand what may be inhibiting their effective participation in peacebuilding. An effective police service that fairly and justly services communities within the newly established rule of law will be instrumental to peacebuilding efforts.

To conclude, we look forward to the first-ever annual session of the Peacebuilding Commission and commend that initiative. We reiterate our commitment to the effectiveness of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and to fine-tuning that architecture and its operationalization. It is absolutely critical to our ultimate substantive goal, which is to genuinely tailor peacebuilding to the very specific needs of the countries concerned, to prevent a relapse into conflict and, instead, to provide a path to security and development.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Luxembourg for its initiative in convening this open meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I thank Mr. Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ms. Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, for their briefings.

Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of a conflict has an effective role to play in eliminating the root causes of conflict. It has an important bearing on achieving lasting peace and sustainable development in countries and regions emerging from conflict. In recent years, the United Nations has been actively participating in peacebuilding efforts in the countries and regions on its agenda, where it has accumulated rich experience and achieved significant results.

The United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone recently completed its work and is hailed as a success story in the area of peacebuilding. At the same time, peacebuilding is a lengthy, complex and difficult task. Under the current circumstances, peacebuilding faces new issues and challenges that require the international community's in-depth consideration and proper response. I would like to highlight the following four points.

First, post-conflict peacebuilding must fully respect the ownership of the relevant countries, which should assume the primary responsibility for peacebuilding. The international community should fully respect their sovereignty and will and provide assistance pursuant to the priorities identified by their Governments. The United Nations and its agencies, in assisting in peacebuilding efforts, should strengthen partnerships with the countries concerned and help them to draw up integrated peacebuilding strategies on the basis of the local context. Owing to the different histories and specific conditions, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to peacebuilding. The international community should fully respect cultural traditions and the prevailing requirements of the countries concerned, pay attention to the actual conditions on the ground and not just automatically replicate past practices.

Secondly, post-conflict peacebuilding efforts should focus on removing the deep-rooted causes of conflict, with a particular emphasis on economic and social development. In post-conflict peacebuilding, the international community has long emphasized human rights, the rule of law and security sector reform without paying adequate attention to the economic and social development of the countries concerned and with limited input in that regard. We call on the international community to focus more on the economic and social development of the countries concerned. Only through rapid economic recovery and recontruction will the affected populations be able to enjoy the dividends of peace and will a solid foundation for political reconciliation, the stabilization of security and the establishment of a political basis for the peace process be laid.

Thirdly, post-conflict peacebuilding should enjoy adequate and guaranteed resources. The international community's swift and timely support in the form of assistance to the countries concerned is an important factor in smoothly achieving peacebuilding objectives. The United Nations should continue to heed the

financing requirements of reconstruction programmes in the countries concerned. The Organization should also urge the international community to continue to provide assistance to peacebuilding activities within those countries and to work together to broaden the channels for financing with no political preconditions for assistance. In that regard, China commends the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund for its active role and supports its efforts to improve its work in enhancing the evaluation of the projects that it has carried and the efficiency of the utilization of resources. China will continue to support the Peacebuilding Fund within its abilities.

Fourthly, post-conflict peacebuilding requires closer coordination and cooperation by all parties concerned. The United Nations should continue to play a coordinating role in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts and should seek to establish a stable and cooperative relationship with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the African Development Bank and other international and regional financial institutions. At the same time, it should make use of the unique peacebuilding advantages of regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union, in order to make progress in that regard. The relevant agencies within the United Nations system should have a clear division of labour and should strengthen cooperation. The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission should have a greater role in coordinating peacebuilding activities.

China has always supported peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries. We are ready to continue to work with the international community in helping countries emerging from conflict to achieve durable peace and sustainable development.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan): I would like to begin by thanking the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing and leadership on this matter, as well as to express my thanks for the excellent briefings provided by our friends Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and by Ms. Helen Clarke, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

My comments this morning will be brief and a little bit different. I therefore respectively beg the Council's understanding in advance.

We agree that inclusivity is the key to successful post-conflict peacebuilding, but we do not agree it can be attained through political processes or through an economic development agenda alone, either separately or together, as is proposed in the Secretary-General's report (S/2012/746). Nor does it make any sense that national ownership is highlighted repeatedly when the very emphasis on the need for inclusivity makes it clear that in most, if not all, post-conflict societies — as opposed to normal developing countries — there is no cohesive nation that can go about owning anything. Own what? Owned by whom? By the nation still at war, only there is no killing and we perceive the acrimony a little less easily?

In post-conflict societies, the conflict is not actually past; it is current, present; it is there now. Only the killing is past, otherwise the conflict continues as before, only now through political manoeuvres, corruption and criminality.

That being the case, advancing the importance of national ownership is the wrongful application of ordinary development practices to a context that is markedly different, even if the two contexts share some of the same characteristics — youth unemployment, poor education facilities, poor infrastructure, et cetera. That is where we seem to have been fooled: post-killing environments and ordinary development challenges are not one and the same thing; they are different, much in the same way the PBC and UNDP were established to address, at their core, different challenges. The quicker we understand that, the better.

It is absolutely true that the path to eventual national ownership, once a country has graduated from a post-killing status, under strict United Nations observation, to weak-State status, has to — must, even — run through the inclusivity stage first, if it hopes to get anywhere. But there is a major piece missing in the Secretary-General's analysis, and that is that inclusivity cannot simply be obtained through political power-sharing, elections, training, employment schemes and the building of infrastructure alone. That approach has now run its course. It is flawed, and has failed more times than it has succeeded.

Nothing bears that point out more tragically than then entire content of paragraph 15 in the Secretary-General's 2012 report. Given what has happened in South Sudan since the report was published, the contents of paragraph 15 are a telling, if not tragic, example of how the United Nations not only missed the bull's-eye but was aiming in the wrong direction to begin with.

Inclusivity, at a level that makes it meaningful, can properly be brought about only when a deeper psychological accommodation is reached by ex-combatants and their communities in recognition of what has often brought them to fight in the first place. In other words, the deficit of trust spoken of in the Secretary-General's report can be reduced to zero only when there is also a proper resolution to the divergent historical narratives.

I will not repeat all we said on this subject in January (see S/PV.7105), save to say events since the thematic debate on historical narratives, events which the Council has wrestled with every week, have only brought into sharper focus the undeniable importance of history, of understanding it properly, of not abusing it, but finding the truth, rejecting the lies, and not just by the lied to, but more important, by the liars themselves and, after a reckoning, a settling of history, the finding of a permanent reconciliation, and one that will produce the "inclusivity" necessary for later, much-needed, political processes and economic growth.

Finally, a point in relation to women and peacebuilding: we all believe strongly that only good can come out of greater female participation in societies recovering from war. It is not just a women's right or a human right; it is a matter of basic justice, and it can only be for the betterment of the country. But it is also obvious that, in many parts of the world, very impressive economic growth was still achieved following the end of devastating conflicts, without women playing a major role in them. In other words, it is better to make the argument that even more could be achieved with the greater participation of women, rather than by saying, simply, that women are necessary for the successful economic development of a society or community.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Patriota, and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Ms. Clark, for their informative briefings, in which they highlighted the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations, the difficulties facing the Organization and the outlook in this area.

The Russian Federation considers assistance to peacebuilding as one of the key factors for the effective resolution of conflicts and ensuring that they do not recur. In most cases, countries torn apart by war or crises are not capable of coping on their own with the broad array of problems related to restoring security and law and order, protecting human rights and fighting poverty. International assistance in this regard is particularly crucial.

At the same time, we are convinced that the key to successful and sustainable results from this kind of cooperation lies in national ownership on the part of States. They have to determine their priorities for themselves, whose practical implementation should be overseen by national Government institutions that represent the interests of society as a whole.

Considerable work in the area of peacebuilding is carried out in the framework of the United Nations through peacekeeping missions and the Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific configurations. That endeavour entails considerable difficulties and challenges that require coordinated efforts on the part of Member States, United Nations funds and programmes, regional organizations, the Secretariat and international financial institutions. Peacebuilding tasks are increasingly included in the multifaceted mandates of peacekeeping operations. First and foremost, that means assisting in the sectors of security, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, supporting the re-establishment of law enforcement and the rule of law. In general, such efforts are required to address the causes of a conflict and prevent its recurrence. Peacekeepers should not replace national bodies.

International assistance in the area of peacekeeping remains fragmentary. There is a lack of coordination in the division of labour that leads to a duplication of peacebuilding efforts, non-optimal use of resources and the squandering of available resources. In that regard, it is important that all those involved in peacebuilding work clearly within their mandates and the established regulations. The examples of Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic require a thorough analysis of peacebuilding activity, with a focus on the reasons for the lack of expected results and the failure to ensure that such situations do not relapse into crisis.

It is clear that, to achieve practical results, there is a need to continue fine-tuning the peacebuilding architecture at the global and country levels alike. The Russian Federation supports the work of the Peacebuilding Commission as one of the central intergovernmental bodies for coordinating such

cooperation. In our view, its added value is to provide quality advisory assistance to the Security Council at its request on countries on the agendas of both bodies. In our view, the Commission, in the framework of its mandate, should contribute to dealing with major crosscutting issues related to peacebuilding and to the United Nations system as a whole, and that require multidimensional discussion with Member States within the framework of specialized United Nations bodies.

The events planned for this year, including holding the first annual session of the Commission and the beginning of the scheduled 2015 review, will make a significant contribution to consolidating the Commission as an intergovernmental body that plays a key role in the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations.

Today the Peacebuilding Commission has acquired significant experience in direct dialogue with national Governments, based on mutual control in fulfilling obligations as well as through coordinating the efforts of international players in implementing the priorities determined by post-conflict countries. A positive example of that could be the stabilization of the situations in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Burundi. It is essential to consolidate those successes, including through continual security sector reform, forward-looking socioeconomic development and combating poverty and unemployment. United Nations funds should play a key role.

The Peacebuilding Fund is one of the most important components of the peacebuilding architecture. That mechanism, a term-loan facility that contributes to attracting long-term resources for rebuilding and development, has confirmed its effectiveness. On that basis, Russia has continued to provide an annual contribution of $2 million to the Fund. Providing assistance to the Fund on the basis of programmes and projects developed by the United Nations and the Government in question should take into account the priorities of the host country and ensure its responsible approach in using that kind of assistance. At the same time, it is important to ensure that countries do not become addicted to donor infusions.

We continue to consider that the country principle is key in distributing resources. We do not think that artificial priorities should be imposed on countries. It is the Governments themselves that should determine their priorities.

Mrs. Le Fraper du Hellen (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Eliasson; the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriora; and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Ms. Clark, for their briefings.

Two years after the publication of the Secretary-General's report on the issue of peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), I think it is very useful for the Council to once again express its views on a subject that is at the heart of the work of the Organization. I would like to thank the Luxembourg presidency of the Council for convening this discussion.

I would like to recall some principles that France considers essential with regard to peacebuilding.

First, peacebuilding implies the establishment of inclusive processes, in particular of a national dialogue — of course, one that is inclusive in the sense mentioned by the Ambassador of Jordan in his statement today. In other words, it is not just a sharing of power and infrastructure; it is effectively finding a narrative that can lead to reconciliation. It was precisely to relaunch the national dialogue that had been obstructed and a conflict narrative that was going in contradictory directions that the Council visited Mali in early February to try to put the stabilization process back on a better basis.

Working to build peace after a conflict must also include all segments of society. We support the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report designed to ensure the active participation of women in peacebuilding processes. We often say that and do little, and therefore we need to make progress in that area. In that respect, the appointment of the interim Head of the Transitional Government in the Central African Republic, Ms. Samba-Panza, and the important place given to women in her Government has, we feel, been a good example of that. Over and above the participation of women, we must ensure the participation of all sectors of society in the transition process.

Another principle for establishing the bases for a lasting peace is the need to work on justice. Justice remains the key to all post-conflict stabilization. Through its practical experience in a number of countries, the Council has identified several key areas for intervention when it comes to justice — support for the criminal justice system, independent justice, the establishment of a prison system, security sector

reform and support for the international criminal justice system.

National Governments bear the primary responsibility for bringing to justice and punishing those responsible for atrocities, including those committed in post-conflict situations. But when States fail in their responsibilities, the International Criminal Court must play its part. Cases from a number of countries in which we are involved in peacebuilding — the Central African Republic, Mali and the Democratic Republic of the Congo — have already been referred to the Court.

Finally, it is essential to begin long-term work to rebuild institutions that inspire public confidence. Again in reference to the Central African Republic, up until today, thanks to the action of the African force supported by the French Operation Sangaris, large-scale massacres have been avoided. However, we face a situation of insecurity borne of the collapse of the State. It is therefore essential, parallel to security measures, to act immediately to restore the State's authority and constructive relations with the society as a whole. For that, certain basic actions need to be carried out, such as ensuring that civil servants are paid, which would get the police and gendarmerie forces back to work, as well as the courts and detention centres.

We cannot simply separate the opposing armies. We also must arrest and bring to justice those who order or incite violence. We must also bear in mind the goal of holding elections no later than February 2015.

To re-establish the Central African Republic State, those projects need resources. With regard to those priority areas, the United Nations — today through the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in the Central African Republic and as soon as possible, we hope, through a peacekeeping operation — will have an essential role to play. The international community, however, must strengthen its mobilization in order to provide the means necessary. As emphasized by Ms. Clark, UNDP has a critical role to play in that regard. It has the ability to develop policies and to mobilize, as we saw in the Central African Republic, where the UNDP has shown its effectiveness and its ability to react in recent crises by setting up a multi-donor fund.

In the face of the challenge of peacebuilding, the United Nations offers an opportunity to act in a coordinated fashion. For our part, we would like to stress the need to proceed in stages and to think carefully about the various phases of transition. Peacekeeping operations themselves have now become multidimensional, and from their deployment try to respond to varying challenges in countries where State structures have practically disappeared.

It is important that peacekeeping operations pave the way for peacebuilding. We must explain, however, that those operations cannot in one year or in a few months accomplish a whole multitude of tasks. Previous speakers today have referred to the difficulties that we have encountered in South Sudan.

Moreover, there must be close cooperation between UNDP and the special political missions or the civilian component of peacekeeping operations, so as to avoid duplication. Exit strategies must be prepared, which should guide the action of missions on a daily basis. In those complex peacebuilding processes, I would like to stress the particular importance of reinforcing the link between the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, who depend upon the resources provided by the peacekeeping operations or special missions, and the United Nations country teams, directed by the Resident Coordinators.

The country teams are expected to take over, at the appropriate moment, the leading of peacekeeping operations to ensure an effective transition towards development programmes. That is an important challenge, which we can see in countries such as Burundi and Sierra Leone. The international community must remain mobilized in those types of situations because, if we do not, we cannot exclude a relapse into conflict after the when different actors are demobilized.

Lastly, coordination among all actors contributing to peacebuilding is essential. Others before me have mentioned the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, endorsed in Busan at the end of 2011, which reminds us the necessity of coordination. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund are entities that can play a very useful role in support of activities on the ground and to ensure the necessary synergies with the missions in place. In that regard, I welcome the establishment of justice/police oversight mechanisms in Liberia that are financed by the Peacebuilding Fund and supported by the United Nations Mission in Liberia. In our opinion, those are very interesting examples of cooperation among different United Nations actors.

We are certain tha the review of the Peacebuilding Commission architecture in 2015 will give us an

opportunity to go even further in terms of coordination and the further strengthening of the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, an institution in which we truly believe and which has made a lasting contribution since its establishment to strengthening States in post-conflict situations.

Mr. Cherif (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I thank the President for having organizing this morning's meeting on the peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict. I also thank the speakers for their detailed briefings on the topic.

Today, the world is ravaged by a multitude of conflicts. Darfur, the Sudan, South Sudan, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Syrian crisis, to mention but a few, are the best examples. Those conflicts have completely undone social fabrics, which have become difficult to reconstruct. Populations are traumatized and divided by deep hatred that gives rise to war, which turns sometimes into genocide. That is the case with Syria and the Central African Republic, where large-scale destruction have forced distraught populations to leave to seek refuge in neighbouring countries. To put an end to the spiral of violence, the United Nations, in its role as guarantor of world peace, mobilizes massive human, material and financial resources.

Conflict is a moment of tension with multiple potential causes — the clash of opposing political, economic and cultural interests or due to expansionary ambitions. A conflict can be long-lasting and engulf human lives and bring about human rights violations, such as rape, the enlistment of children in the army, population transfers and modifications of borders. War is a source of underdevelopment because it generates ignorance, hate and lack of trust, and is therefore a useless waste of time and energy. It is clear that military intervention can contribute to the settlement of certain conflicts, but dialogue remains the simplest and least costly of all methods.

Peacebuilding through dialogue is the way to maintain lasting and viable peace, while development assistance provides the tools for strengthening it. Africa experiences many problems that dangerously undermine its socioeconomic development. The extreme poverty of its populations is a major source of conflict. Countries such as the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, South Sudan will not experience lasting peace in the short term after an agreement is reached following national dialogue if peacebuilding is not folled up with massive amounts of development aid. To achieve that end, donor countries must work out comprehensive national strategies for better peacebuilding. They must define intervention strategies for peacebuilding in those countries when the need is felt and support national dialogue and provide development assistance, inter alia.

Peacebuilding requires the mobilization of various actors on the ground. In Africa, women are peacebuilding actors. As women and children are the primary victims of conflict, they need to be involved in the search for peace, peacebuilding and peace negotiations. Women are a positive force that is often overlooked. Women of the African diaspora can play a significant role in reconstruction and peacebuilding. Examples throughout the world show that women generally participate actively in seeking peace.

What makes peacebuilding difficult in the aftermath of conflict is not only the absence of will on the part of the parties in conflict to stop the violence, but also the refusal of parties involved in the settlement of conflicts to address the underlying causes of conflicts.

My country, Chad, experienced several decades of civil war from which it was able to escape thanks to mediation and dialogue among the different components of its society, where women are in the majority. Peacebuilding became a reality thanks to the mobilization of all parts of the nation. Today, the results achieved are appreciated by the entire international community, even if progress is still needed in some areas. Women are significantly represented in State institutions. Medical, anti-retroviral, obstetric and surgical care are given cost-free, and a mother's and children's hospital was built.

As for development, the structures for distributing aid were implemented to help women to develop income-generating revenues.

In conclusion, in Chad, like elsewhere, peacebuilding requires robust support from the international community as a whole, and in particular the United Nations.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am grateful for the statements made by the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson; by Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission; and by Ms. Helen Clark, Administration of the United Nations Development Programme.

As the Secretary-General pointed out in his report of October 2010 (S/2010/466), an effective response on the part of the Organization requires developing a broad-based and coordinated strategy for peacebuilding, one that is based on identifying priorities on the part of local and authorities and that sets goals and concrete and achievable time frames. The report also points out that such work requires developing efforts at humanitarian assistance, establishing or re-establishing the rule of law, drafting and implementing security and justice policies, promoting sustainable development and a rigorous, democratic policy for protecting, promoting and ensuring human rights. No doubt, that continues to be an existing challenge.

Having had an opportunity to serve as a non-permanent member of the Security Council and to actively participate in the Peacebuilding Commission makes it possible for us to reflect upon profound and valuable experiences. The first that I would like to share with you, Madam, President, and with my colleagues has to do with the value of peace, which can be evaluated on the basis of its relationship with the persistence of inequality, violence and oppression. I say that because, as we have seen from our field visits with the Security Council, at the time peacebuilding work begins after a conflict, we have noted the existence of certain myths and fictions at the point of departure.

We believe that post-conflict peacebuilding has to do with communities and "doing" — that is to say, that it must take place in a concrete context that involves power and social relations, where peace is no longer clear-cut or indisputable. Although we could begin our peacebuilding undertaking with uniform, universal approaches, we would be doing so in the dark and while ignoring the underlying causes and specific reasons that led a given society to conflict. That has been a lesson that we have learned.

There are no universal approaches for working on a coordinated plan for peacebuilding, since a set of uniform practices might not adequately reflect, include or express the reality in a specific society. We all know of examples where post-conflict assistance policies have become, or been experienced as, an imposition, or have worked on the basis of a "remote control" approach in which certain generic programmes or actions are applicable, in the abstract, to any country in the world.

We know that from experience; it is one of the lessons we have learned. Such cooperation is not really transformational, but rather is profoundly inefficient, as it is not sensitive to the concrete social, economic and cultural conditions in which it seeks to achieve lasting peace and sustainable development.

We have learned that, in our post-conflict peacebuilding efforts, it is our responsibility to begin any process of change with questions, and with the ability to listen and to watch. That will lead us to an understanding of who and what causes or motives led that specific society, at a specific point in time, to actually choose to destroy its prospects for the future. That has enabled us to understand that peacebuilding is a process that cannot be imposed or administered from the outside, but rather one that must arise from the capacities and hopes and interests of each society. National ownership of that process must take place in a progressive manner. That is not only the most respectful way of achieving our goals, but also a precondition for achieving true peace.

Being a member of the Security Council has enabled us to grasp, on the ground, the need to move away from the myths and fictions that could lead us down dead-end streets or into ineffective actions to achieve peace in post-conflict situations.

One example of that, which Council members have certainly heard of, is the myth of a lost paradise. In a refugee camp in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, one often hears women say that in the past they were happy, but they lived well and were never victims of violence, and there were no problems in their communities. I think that is an idealization of a past that never existed. It can be understood as a way of grieving, and that is the way that we should understand it. But in our Organization, we cannot work in post-conflict societies by looking in the rear-view mirror at a past that never existed. It is precisely the empowerment of members of society that enables them to remember the past, even painfully, in order to be able to face the difficulties of the present moment and meet its challenges, in order to build the future that they needed and deserve.

Another myth that we encountered — again in a refugee camp, but in the Sudan — and that causes ethical tension for us, is when the presence of the United Nations or other international organizations on the ground gives rise to or permits a growing belief that the future of that community will be resolved through that presence and thanks to it, and that the possibility for those people to live in a happy society is in the hands of those saviours. To allow that kind of belief to

grow is not only illegitimate, ethically speaking, but it institutionally reproduces a mentality of dependence, which defines people and countries as beneficiaries of aid and at the same time prevents people and communities from becoming subjects of change, with rights and responsibilities that they have freely taken on in order to build or rebuild a social compact and lasting peace.

In another refugee camp, a woman told us that for her, peace was a fleeting moment between two wars. That is the myth of eternal return. For her, it will always be that way — a fleeting instant between two wars. Our responsibility must be to overcome such a defeatist attitude, such a fatalistic stance. That is our responsibilty.

I would like to note the important reports that we have received and read. We in the Peacebuilding Commission and the Council need to ask ourselves which States need which kind of democracy, and which kind of democracy is needed for peace.

We have also learned that building or rebuilding a State in the post-conflict stage cannot be based on a logic of power, on the idea that "man is a wolf to his fellow man" or on enduring conflict or dissent. We have also learned that, in a post-conflict society, authoritarianism, uniformity and a hegemonic belief that there is only one right way are not the path to lasting peace. We have learned that the path to lasting peace is through a democracy that is founded on deliberation, equality and liberty and a just and inclusive society, with full respect for human rights. The paradox is that we have learned that and know it clearly, but the belief that man is a wolf to his fellow man and the hegemonic insistence that there is only one way forward persist, even in post-conflict societies, like a trap that we must seek to remove.

I have allowed myself to reflect on those abstract ideas because this kind of meeting allows us to reflect on things. Often we make decisions as if we were firemen putting out fires. I think the Peacebuilding Commission has an enormous preventive role. The idea is to consolidate peace in order to prevent violence from resuming, hate from becoming entrenched and war from destroying.

I would recall Mr. Brahimi's concept of the three circles when he told us how he saw the situation in Syria. In the Council and in the Peacebuilding Commission, the United Nations Development Programme shows us that the local level and the national level have to be incorporated into the regional level, and the regional level into the international level. It is no longer possible to think in any other way, not simply because of the Internet, but because the world is interdependent. We are interconnected, and human rights have become universal.

This is another area of tension that we are discussing today in the Council, and also in the Assembly. How can we ensure that universal human rights, which must be included in the very essence of building and rebuilding the rule of law in post-conflict societies, are not subject to opinion? How can we ensure that cultural, ethnic, gender-based, racial and religious diversity is not crushed and does not become a victim of uniformity? I think that, in our efforts for post-conflict peacebuilding, we need to work and provide assistance and cooperation to ensure that the social compacts that arise from the multifaceted identities of the various countries include, woven into their very structure, that which is non-negotiable, namely, respect for human rights. There should be a democratic debate on what is actually negotiable, that is, the diverse and pluralistic identity of a country.

I am very grateful to you, Madam President, for the opportunity to hold this debate. We continue to support the principles that other colleagues have highlighted. We thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his assessment of the implementation of the priorities identified by the Council in 2012. I also thank Ms. Clark. She is aware of how much I respect her not only on a personal level but also owing to the fact that the United Nations Development Programme introduced the aspect of human development on the basis of lasting and sustainable economic, social, cultural and environmental development. The work of UNDP in post-conflict situations provides a time-based, cultural and strategic bridge for the alleviation of the urgent needs of hunger and poverty through humanitarian development assistance from a situation of desperation to the hope of building or rebuilding a country, from the fragmentation of a country to its social cohesion. Those are of course enormous challenges.

Turning to the issue of women, children and young people, my philosophy professor used to say that it is not enough simply to include women in the electoral process in order to build a democracy. Democratic elections in which women participate are not sufficient. Women should have the right to vote. However, there

must also be economic, social and political gender-empowerment and ownership among women for them to truly participate freely and equally in decision-making processes. They can then once again raise children who have seen their future destroyed, not without hope but as equal human beings.

Mr. Shearman (United Kingdom): I thank you, Madam President, for convening this debate. I would also like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for their briefings.

I would like to focus on three issues: first, improving the ability of the United Nations to plan, adapt and draw down its peacebuilding interventions; secondly, the role of women in peacebuilding; and, thirdly, the 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture.

As others have said, the Council will reach an important milestone next week as we close the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. The people of Sierra Leone have worked hard to stabilize their country and, although they still face many challenges, they are now on the path to a brighter future. The United Nations should be proud of the central role that it has played in helping Sierra Leone to recover from its devastating civil war. That is an example of how effective, tailored and well-planned United Nations peacebuilding interventions can improve people's lives.

In 1992, former Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali introduced the concept of peacebuilding in "An Agenda for Peace". Since then, the Council has launched numerous missions with mandates that recognize the importance not only of monitoring a ceasefire but also of building an enduring peace. Countries such as Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire, which once tore themselves apart in civil wars, have made considerable progress in building stability, aided by United Nations missions. The experience of more than two decades of United Nations peacebuilding has taught us that strong national ownership of inclusive peacebuilding processes and a focus on building national institutions are essential to securing a sustainable peace.

However, recent relapses into conflict in the Central African Republic and South Sudan demonstrate that we must constantly review and improve our approaches to peacebuilding. Peacebuilding is becoming more complex and challenging for the United Nations as new drivers of conflict, such as organized crime, drug trafficking and the illicit trade in natural resources, emerge. We must rise to those new challenges. The United Nations must improve the way in which it analyses conflict, plans and reviews missions and prepares for transitions.

In each mission setting, the United Nations should undertake a rigorous analysis of the conflict and its causes in order to understand how to focus and prioritize its peacebuilding activities. Missions must coordinate closely with their partners on the ground, including the United Nations country team. United Nations agencies, funds and programmes play an important role in delivering critical peacebuilding tasks. Arrangements such as the joint global focal point for the police, justice and corrections areas in the rule of law in post-conflict and other crisis situations are essential to ensuring a united "One UN" approach to peacebuilding.

In addition, we need systematic reviews of existing missions to consider regularly whether a mission's mix of military, police and civilian capacities remain appropriate in the light of changing circumstances in the field. Finally, we need to ensure that there is a clear plan for drawing down each mission once we can responsibly do so.

In turn, as Council members, we have the responsibility to ensure that the mandates that we provide to United Nations missions are focused, realistic and prioritized. Such steps will allow United Nations peacebuilding interventions to be more dynamic and ensure that such interventions have the right focus and capabilites to help host Governments and countries build lasting peace.

I would like to turn to the issue of women and peacebuilding, which is a high priority for the United Kingdom. Since the end of the Cold War, women have represented only 4 per cent of signatories to peace agreements, less than 3 per cent of mediators at peace talks and less than 10 per cent of those sitting at the table to negotiate on behalf of a party to conflict. More must be done to promote the role of women in post-conflict peacebuilding processes.

In that regard, the adoption of resolution 2122 (2013), last October, was a positive step forward. Thye full implementation of the resolution by all stakeholders is now key. The United Kingdom, for its part, is actively working to promote women's participation in peacebuilding. For example, on Syria, we provided the

Syrian National Coalition with negotiation training on gender issues and women's participation and played a leading role in supporting increased women's representation in the recent second Geneva Conference on Syria.

We continue to call on the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and special envoys to establish regular consultations with women's organizations and to work with civil society to support women's leadership. We also continue to call on the Secretary-General to strengthen gender training and experts in mediation teams and to support the appointment of senior women as United Nations mediators. As the Ambassador of Rwanda said, increasing women's participation and leadership in peacebuilding is a practical necessity, not a philosophical proposition.

I would like to conclude with a brief word on the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. That will be an important moment for all United Nations bodies involved in peacebuilding activities. The United Kingdom believes that the review should not only focus on the institutions established in 2005, but also should consider the effectiveness of all United Nations peacebuilding activities and the contributions made by all United Nations operational peacebuilding divisions, including the Secretariat and agencies, funds and programmes. Since 2005, peacebuilding has moved on and is now much more mainstreamed into the day-to-day work of many parts of the United Nations system. A narrow focus on the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office will not provide Member States with a full evaluation of the effectiveness of the United Nations peacebuilding activities.

Mr. Baublys (Lithuania): I would like to thank all speakers for their interventions. Sustaining and consolidating peace is a central objective of the United Nations peace and security architecture. It is our collective responsibility to consolidate the gains that we have achieved and to prevent post-conflict countries from sliding back into violence. The sustained attention and consistent commitment of the international community and strong national ownership are critical to achieving lasting peace.

Lithuania recognizes the importance of the main elements contained in the 2012 report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusive processes, instituition-building and sustained international support, accompanied by strong national ownership.

The international community should also devote enhanced attention to minimizing the impact of external stresses such as cross-border conflict and the possible spillover of threats posed by international criminal networks. Internal factors, such as political exclusion, real or perceived discrimination against social groups, corruption, high levels of youth unemployment and unequally distributed natural resources could also be profoundly destabilizing for countries that have weak institutions and are politically and socially fragmented.

In my remarks, I would like to focus on two elements: institution-building and the rule of law. Under last month's Lithuanian presidency, the Council held an open debate (see S/PV.7113) and adopted on a presidential statement on the rule of law (S/PRST/2014/5). That exercise emphasized, once again, the importance of the rule of law as one of the key elements of conflict prevention, peacebuilding, conflict resolution and peacekeeping. Moreover, it unfolded around the idea that early peacebuilding starts with peacekeeping missions and that their support to strengthening rule-of-law institutions should lay foundations for long-term peacebuilding objectives. In that context, the role of the effective management of transitions, as well as the importance of partnerships and cooperation with Member States, regional, subregional and international partners, was underlined. The Council also reiterated that national ownership, responsibility and political will were critical in building sustainable peace.

Strengthening formal and informal institutions, restoring core governance functions and equitable service delivery, and strengthening domestic accountability systems in countries emerging from conflicts are practical expression of sustainable peace. Institutions take a long time to develop into a solid forum for inclusive political participation and for the delivery of security, social services, justice, education and economic opportunities. The capacities of Governments to sustain and empower such institutions remain a key challenge for countries emerging from conflicts. Strong leadership and political will are crucial.

Another important element for the peacebuilding is inclusivity. Elected Governments must keep various societal and political forces engaged and include them in the decision-making process. A very important

aspect of inclusivity relates to the participation of women and youth. We constantly urge the inclusion of women in peacebuilding processes, but what does that mean in reality? Women are powerful agents of change in rebuilding communities affected by conflict. Women bring their experiences of war to the conference table. Women make up 80 per cent of refugees. They are often victims of sexual violence, and war widows. When they are combatants, they also have different needs and experiences from those of male combatants. Democratic governance, security sector reform, land tenure, justice and the protection of human rights are key elements for sustainable peace where women's interests and gender perspectives should be taken into account.

It is very important to follow the United Nations seven-point action plan on women's participation in peacebuilding, in which the United Nations committed to ensuring women's participation in conflict resolution, post-conflict building and mediation. It also promotes women's representation in post-conflict governance.

Today the Council referred to resolution 2122 (2013), which remains a key element in the expanding framework for women's contribution to peace.

In order to more effectively help countries affected by conflict, the efforts of the international community should be guided by a spirit of partnership that enhances and better coordinates the links among the United Nations civilian capacity, Member States, regional organizations, international financial institutions and civil society. I cannot stress enough the role of the Peace-building Commission (PBC) in coordinating and reinforcing the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in that regard. Increased interaction and cooperation with the World Bank and collaboration on the ground are required. The PBC role must not be reduced to that of a mere fundraiser. The discussion on how to deepen and focus the advisory and support role of the PBC is very timely and, in that context, its upcoming mandated review next year is very important.

The PBC clearly adds more value to our deliberations in the Security Council. The country-specific configuration Chairs of the PBC could participate in Council meetings at which the situation concerning the country in question is considered. There could also be greater coordination before and during country visits by PBC Chairs and Council members.

Finally, we look forward to the Secretary-General's next report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict later this year, which we trust will provide a basis for our deliberations on the lessons learned from the United Nations response in countries affected by or emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now make a statement in my national capacity as the representative of Luxembourg.

I thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriota, and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Porgramme (UNDP), Ms. Helen Clark, for their presentations. They highlighted the close links that exist between the various actors and entities of the United Nations system, the United Nations Development Group and the peacebuilding architecture established in 2005. The Deputy Secretary-General, who was one of the founding fathers of that architecture, urged the Council to embark upon a reflection in the light of the in-depth review of the peacebuilding architecture planned for 2015. I hope we will respond to that call and be able to continue today's discussions between now and the annual debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission, to be held in July, and beyond.

Our briefers underlined in their presentations that peacebuilding involved everybody. That is a long-term endeavour that must mobilize all the life force of a country or region as a whole, and the consistent support of the international community. There are positive examples that should encourage us in our efforts — I am referring in particular to Sierra Leone, where the transition from the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone to the United Nations country team will be completed successfully at the end of this month. I am also thinking of Guinea, where the smooth holding of legislative elections in 2013 and the acceptance of their results allowed for the transition in that country to bear fruit, on the basis of an inclusive political dialogue facilitated by the United Nations. In Guinea, all of the key players were directly involved — the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa, UNDP. United Nations funds and programmes, the European Union, bilateral partners and civil society, including women's groups and the Guinea configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, which Luxembourg has had the honour to chair for three years now.

However, examples of relapse into deadly conflict, as in the Central African Republic and South Sudan,

show that there remains some way to go when it comes to peacebuilding. Whenever human rights are violated or dynamics of exclusion or marginalization arise, or the narrowing of political space threatens the progress achieved, vigilance and action are required. That is the crux of the "Rights up front" initiative, launched by the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretary-General last December.

Peacebuilding and the strengthening of the State also have a political dimension. We cannot ignore the realities of the political economy of a country, the underlying causes of conflict, the risks posed by corruption, governance that is not conducive to development, political, economic or social exclusion, organized crime or political cultures in which the winner takes all. Building lasting peace requires the establishment of inclusive political processes and settlements, competent and accountable national institutions, and ongoing support and attention from the international community.

We welcome the efforts of fragile States in the Group of Seven Plus and the conclusion of national agreements under the "New Deal". Mutual accountability exists not only between the Government of a fragile State and its international partners, but also between that Government and its citizens. Peacebuilding requires the achievement of a new social compact. The State should be able to fulfil its regulatory functions that confer its legitimacy. The State should ensure its responsibility in the areas of promoting and protecting human rights, establishing the rule of law and providing public services for the benefit of its citizens. As others today have highlighted genuine national ownership is essential. The process of peacebuilding has to be an inclusive one. It has to reflect true national consensus.

That is why it is also very important to ensure the full involvement of women. Women are essential actors in the peacebuilding process, as shown by the examples mentioned by the Deputy Secretary-General and some of the previous speakers. That is true in Guinea, in Guinea-Bissau, in Liberia and in Yemen.

The Secretary-General's action plan for mainstreaming the issue of the equality of women and men in peacebuilding remains relevant. It is unacceptable that women continue to be the main victims of violence during and after conflict and that, at the same time, they are marginalized when the time comes to resolve those same conflicts and to rebuild the country after the conflict.

I would also like to say a few words on the regional dimension of peacebuilding by invoking the example of the Mano River Union. Three of the four countries of that region — Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone — are being assisted by the Peacebuilding Commission. Last July, the three country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission organized a joint meeting with the participation of the Secretary-General of the Mano River Union in order to discuss challenges common to the countries of the region. Last October, those countries adopted a security strategy focused on border security of the Mano River Union, with the support of the United Nations Office for West Africa. The implementation of the strategy should make it possible to prevent conflicts and thereby build peace at the regional level.

To conclude, I would like to come back to the peacebuilding architecture established in 2005. I think we need to duly acknowledge the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission as a consultative body that could offer advice to the Security Council, and as an adviser and constructive partner for countries emerging from conflict. There is considerable scope to maximize the potential of that body. Let us do that without waiting for the results of the review scheduled in 2015.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.